

1

2

3

4

5

6

)

)

)

9

10

1

12

1 Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director's designee, Mary
2 Ann Parsons, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position. By letter dated October 6,
3 1999, Ms. Parsons determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On November 5,
4 1999, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals
5 Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

6 Appellant works in the Retrospective Ratings Program. The Retrospective Ratings Program is
7 separate from Employer Services. Before an employer is accepted into the voluntary Retrospective
8 Ratings Program, a mandatory Industrial Insurance "policy" is developed for the employer by
9 Employer Services. An employer can then request to be in the Retrospective Ratings Program.
10 When an employer's request is accepted, their policy is grouped with other employers with similar
11 work. This results in lower insurance rates for the employer. Appellant is responsible for following
12 established procedures to determine into which Retrospective Ratings Program group the employer
13 is placed. However, Appellant is not the final decision maker if an employer challenges his
14 determination.

15
16 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** In summary, Appellant disagrees with the Director's
17 determination and asserts that the Director's designee should have found that there is no distinction
18 between a Retrospective Industrial Insurance account/policy and a State Fund Industrial Insurance
19 account/policy and should have found that the duties he performs that are similar to the duties
20 performed by underwriters warrant reallocation of his position to the Industrial Insurance
21 Underwriter 1 classification.

22 Appellant argues that his duties go beyond the complex clerical duties described in the Office
23 Assistant Senior classification and that 80 percent of his duties are similar to the work performed by
24

1 underwriters. Appellant asserts that he makes policy decisions in the approval/denial process for
2 Retrospective Ratings Program enrollees. He contends that his responsibilities require him to apply
3 the basic principles of underwriting, insurance, auditing and accounting and that he is responsible
4 for underwriting and managing Retrospective Rating policies. Appellant asserts that the duties he
5 performs are comparable to the duties performed by Industrial Insurance Underwriters (IIU) and
6 that his position should be reallocated to the IIU 1 classification.

7 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant's duties are best
8 described by the Office Assistant Senior classification. Respondent asserts that Appellant verifies
9 information provided by the employers and that based on this information, he follows established
10 procedures to determine whether an employer should be included with a group enrollment. In
11 addition, Respondent argues that Appellant assigns identification numbers for employers accepted
12 into the Retrospective Ratings Program, inputs information into the computer system, accesses
13 computer reports and provides information to various parties. Respondent argues that Appellant is
14 not responsible for establishing insurance policies and that he does not perform the duties typically
15 assigned to IIUs such as assigning risk classifications to employers, determining experience ratings of
16 employers, determining employer/employee relationships, and reviewing and correcting errors to
17 reports. Respondent contends that the Office Assistant Senior classification provides the best
18 general summary of the type of work assigned to Appellant and that his position should remain
19 allocated to this classification.

20
21 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly
22 allocated to the Office Assistant Senior classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Office Assistant Senior, class code 01011; and Industrial Insurance
2 Underwriter 1; class code 13845.

3 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
4 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
5 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
6 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
7 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
8 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
9 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
10 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).
11

12 The definition and distinguishing characteristics for the Office Assistant Senior classification
13 describe positions that independently perform a variety of complex clerical projects and
14 assignments requiring a substantive knowledge of a variety of rules, regulations, policies,
15 procedures and process.

16 Appellant independently applies established policies and procedures to enroll employers in the
17 Retrospective Ratings Program. He verifies and maintains information input on the computer
18 system, he provides information to various parties and program participants, and he determines
19 whether employers should be enrolled in a particular group program. These duties and
20 responsibilities are encompassed by the Office Assistant Senior (OAS) classification. For example,
21 the OAS classification includes positions that respond to inquires regarding policies and
22 procedures; exercise delegated approval authority; review documents, records or applications; and
23 determine whether information is complete and accurate.
24

1 The definition and distinguishing characteristics for the Industrial Insurance Underwriter 1
2 classification describes positions that underwrite and manage insurance policies for Level 1
3 complexity industries. The typical work for the IIU 1 class describes a position that, in part,
4 “[e]stablishes new State Fund insurance policies, determines proper coverage, evaluates jurisdiction
5 status, assigns risk classification and corresponding rate and determines appropriate experience
6 rating levels . . . [a]nalyzes, calculates and adjusts rates and premiums . . . [m]akes final
7 determination of refunds to policyholders . . . [i]nitiates legal action for unregistered employers . . .
8 reviews and investigates employer notification claims charged in error; reassigns claim to
9 appropriate account. . . .” Appellant is not responsible for establishing new insurance policies,
10 assigning risk classification and corresponding insurance rates, determining appropriate experience
11 rating levels, calculating and adjusting insurance rates, or making final determinations regarding
12 refunds. Therefore, Appellant’s duties do not meet the scope and breadth of duties intended to be
13 encompassed by the IIU 1 classification.

14 Although Appellant’s duties and responsibilities are specific to the field of industrial insurance and
15 are performed in an industrial insurance setting, the scope of his duties and responsibilities are best
16 described as complex clerical functions performed in support of the Retrospective Ratings Program.
17 The Office Assistant Senior classification encompasses the overall level of duties and
18 responsibilities of Appellant’s position.

19
20 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director’s
21 determination dated October 6, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

22 / / / /

23 / / / /

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination dated October 6, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

Leana D. Lamb, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504